

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 27, 2005. This response incorporates claims 5, and 6 into claim 1, and claims 17, and 18 into claim 12 as per the Examiner's recommendations. Additionally, claim 23 has been amended due to reasons stated hereinbelow. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended is earnestly solicited.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

The Examiner contends that the recited maximum pressure level would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and further explains that the disclosure of Gross has a pressure regulator, which is variable from 1-100 psi. However, the Examiner has erred in his assessment on several accounts. First, the disclosure of Gross, which discloses such a range, describes the **adjustable pressure rating** of the particular regulator chosen for use and not the suggested **operational pressure range** of the device (column 3, lines 14 – 23). That is, the range provided merely states the inherent qualities of a consumer available component that is chosen for use with Gross's design. Nevertheless, the operational pressure range (as disclosed in line 22), discloses an operational range of 60-80 psi. It is important to note that there is no disclosure within Gross that suggests the ability to operate at the relatively low pressure level of less than 15 psi, and given the complicated venturi mechanism incorporated therein, one skilled in the art would have a reasonable doubt that the device of Gross would operate correctly at those relatively low pressure levels. Secondly, the nominal pressure rating of the pressure regulating component disclosed by Gross is in the range of 3-100 psi, not 1-100 psi.


It is the firm belief by Applicant that the limitation provided by a jewelry cleaning device having a maximum operational pressure level of 15 psi **by itself** is unobvious to Gross, Baldacci, or any combination thereof. Moreover, the limitation of a maximum operational pressure level of 15 psi provides critical advantages that are not taught or suggested by Gross. In the response to the first office action, Applicant has cited a particular safety agency requirement, namely United Listings (UL) 834, which alleviates many costly safety mechanisms from the design of any steam generating vessel if the maximum operating pressure thereof is maintained below 15 psi. It is this critical advantage that has been discovered by the Applicant that enables a jewelry cleaning device, which is significantly more compact in size and inexpensive to purchase and operate. There is no other device known to the Applicant that incorporates the aforementioned enhanced utility of a steam generating device for the purpose of cleaning jewelry. Thus, given the aforementioned facts, Applicant believes that amended claim is not obvious to Gross in view of Baldacci and requests that the rejection to claim 23 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-4, and 7-11 are dependent upon claim 1 and claims 13-16, and 19-22 are dependent upon claim 12, and thus incorporate all of the limitations of their respective allowable parent claims. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-16, and 19-22 are patentable and respectfully request that their rejections be withdrawn.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended and argued above by Applicant over the prior art of record, Applicant respectfully reconsideration so that the present case may be quickly passed to issue. If any minor issues remain, please contact Applicant at (972) 801-9843.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 02/27/06

By: 
Gerard E. Moy
Reg. No. 52,054

1608 Danube Lane
Plano, Texas 75075
(972) 801-9843